

REMARKS

Claims 1, 6, 8-10 and 12-13 have been amended. Claim 7 has been canceled, without prejudice. Claims 1-6 and 8-14 are pending in this application.

The title of the invention has been amended, as required by the Examiner, to indicate the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claims 8-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, ("Section 112") for being indefinite.

A) With respect to the limitations "first connection detecting means" and "second connection detecting means" of claim 8, original application claim 8, and also application claim 1, provides support that each of the image pickup device (camera) and the external record device (cradle) may have its own distinct connection detecting means. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that, contrary to the Examiner's statement, the specification does not "clearly state[] that they [i.e., first and second connection detecting means] are both the power detection circuit (203)" which is located in the cradle. The portions of the specification cited by the Examiner (pg. 64, ln. 1-3 and pg. 64, ln. 24-pg. 65, ln. 1) state that the first and second connection detecting means may "for instance" correspond to the connection detecting section 501. Also, the specification at pg. 41, ln. 24-25, merely states that the section 501 "is associated with the power detection circuit 203." (emphasis added). In an exemplary embodiment described in the specification, the power detection circuit 203 of the cradle 200 finds (detects) presence or absence of a connection "depending on a voltage level of the power connector 250," such that the circuit 203 may constitute the second detecting means of the

external record device as recited in claim 8. (See pg. 44, ln. 16-19). In addition, in the camera 100 (image pickup device), the CPU 124, "upon detection of the beginning of the charging to the rechargeable battery 122 depending on a voltage level or the like of the rechargeable battery," may allow image data transfer, such that the first connection detecting means of the image pickup device of claim 8 may constitute at least the combination of the rechargeable battery 122 and the CPU 124. (See pg. 45, ln. 10-15; see also pg. 20, ln. 17-20 and pg. 53, ln. 23-pg. 54, ln. 4). Thus, the specification, which includes the originally filed claims, provides support for a (first) connection detecting means in the image pickup device, and another (second) connection detecting means in the external record device, as recited in claim 8. Accordingly, for the above reasons, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the Section 112 rejection of claim 8.

B) With respect to the Section 112 rejection of claim 9 for improper antecedent basis, claim 9 has been amended to clarify that first image data corresponding to a first image is from a given record medium of the image pickup device, and that second image data corresponding to a second image is recorded in the record medium or the external record device depending upon the presence or absence of a connection when pickup of the second image is commanded. Accordingly, based on the amendment of claim 9, the Section 112 rejection of claim 9 has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

The Examiner's statements that independent claims 11 and 14 are allowed, and dependent claim 5 would be allowable if rewritten

to include the limitations of the claims from which it depends, are acknowledged.

Claims 1, 2 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Endo (U.S. Patent Publ. No. 2002/0051639). In addition, claims 3-4, 9 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Endo in view of Terane (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0076440) and Nanba (U.S. Patent No. 6,297,870); claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Endo and Aizawa (U.S. Patent No. 6,832,275); claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Endo in view of Aizawa and Fujimoto (Japanese Publication No. 06-022259); and claims 10 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kayanuma (U.S. Patent No. 7,167,206) in view of Aizawa.

Amended independent claim 1, in relevant part, recites that an image pickup device includes connection detecting means for detecting a connection to an external record device through a connection means, where "the external record device is external to the image pickup device," and furthermore includes:

transfer processing means controlled by the control means for automatically transferring the image data, recorded in the record medium, to the external record device in response to detection by the connection detection means of the connection to the external record device.

(emphasis added; see specification, for example, at pg. 63, ln. 9-10 and pg. 45, ln. 10-17). Accordingly, in an image pickup device of claim 1, connection of the pickup device to an external record device, which is external to the pickup device, may be detected at a connection detecting means in the image pickup device, and image data, which is recorded in a record medium of the

image pickup device, may be automatically transferred to the external record device *in response* to detection, by the connection detecting means of the image pickup device, of the connection of the image pickup device to the external record device. (See specification, for example, at pg. 45, ln. 10-18, and FIGs. 9-10). As in the exemplary embodiment discussed in the specification, image data may be automatically transferred at the moment of "detection" of the connection in the image pickup device, where the detection of the connection may include "detection of the beginning of charging" of the rechargeable battery 122. (See specification, for example, at pg. 45, ln. 10-18).

In Endo, the power supply detection circuit 60 (connection detection means) appears to be within an external record device (cradle 50) which is external to a camera (image pickup device). (See paragraph [0064] and FIG. 1). Endo, thus, does not appear to disclose an image pickup device including a connection detecting means for detecting a connection of the image pickup device to an external record device which is external to the image pickup device, as required by claim 1. In addition, although Endo appears to disclose transfer of data from a flash memory of the camera to an external HDD 62 (external record device) based on an operator selection from a displayed menu (see paragraph [0074]), nowhere do the applied portions of Endo appear to disclose or suggest automatically transferring image data recorded in a record medium of the image pickup device to an external record device "in response to detection by the connection detecting means [of the image pickup device] of the connection to the external record device," as required by claim 1.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is

distinguishable from Endo.

For reasons similar to those previously described with regard to claim 1, it is also respectfully submitted that amended independent claim 8, which includes limitations corresponding to those of claim 1 discussed above, is distinguishable from Endo as applied by the Examiner.

Claim 2 depends from independent claim 1. As a result, claim 2 is distinguishable from Endo as applied by the Examiner for at least the reasons previously described above for claim 1, and because of the further restrictions claim 2 requires.

Amended independent claims 9 and 12 include limitations corresponding to those of amended claim 1 discussed above. As a result, claims 9 and 12 are distinguishable from Endo as applied by the Examiner for at least the reasons previously described. In addition, the Examiner does not appear to rely on Terane and Nanba to overcome the above-described deficiencies of Endo. Accordingly, it is also respectfully submitted that independent claims 9 and 12 are distinguishable from the combination of Endo, Terane and Naba applied by the Examiner for at least the reasons previously described for claim 1.

Claims 3-4 depend from independent claim 1. As a result, claims 3-4 are distinguishable from Endo as applied by the Examiner for at least the reasons previously described. In addition, the Examiner does not appear to rely on Terane and Nanba to overcome the above-described deficiencies of Endo. Accordingly, it is also respectfully submitted that dependent claims 3-4 are distinguishable from the combination of Endo, Terane and Nanba applied by the Examiner for at least the reasons previously described for claim 1, and because of the additional restrictions they include.

Independent claim 6, which is directed to an external record device and has been amended to include limitations corresponding to the allowable subject matter of claims 11 and 14, requires:

speed control means for decreasing a rotational speed of a platter forming the hard disk device when the image data read out is saved on the hard disk device and under a condition in which a voice is recorded at the image pickup device when the image pickup device is commanded for image pickup and the connection detecting means detects that the image pickup device is connected to the external record device.

(emphasis added). Accordingly, in an external record device of claim 6, the rotational speed of a platter forming a hard disk device may be decreased when image data read out from the image pickup device is saved on the hard disk, if the condition is that (i) the image pickup device is detected as connected to the external record device and (ii) voice is recorded at the image pickup device when image pickup is commanded at the image pickup device.

The applied portions of Endo, Aizawa and Fujimoto do not appear to disclose or suggest the features of a decreasing rotational speed of a hard disk platter when read out image data is saved on the platter, as required by claim 6.

It is, therefore, respectfully submitted that claim 6 is distinguishable from any combination of Endo, Aizawa and Fujimoto.

Amended independent claims 10 and 13 recite, in relevant part,

step of detecting by the image pickup device whether or not the image pickup device is connected to the external record device;

step of automatically transferring image data, corresponding to the image, from a given record medium of the image pickup device to the external record device in response to detection by the image pickup device of the connection of the image pickup device to the external record

(emphasis added; see specification, for example, at pg. 45, ln. 10-18 and pg. 63, ln. 9-10).

The applied portions of Kayanuma appear to disclose detection of a connection between a camera 10 and cradle 100, by a control circuit 140 of the cradle 100. The applied portions of Kayanuma, however, do not appear to disclose or suggest detecting connection by an image pickup device (camera) and, furthermore, automatically transferring image data recorded in a record medium of the image pickup device to an external record device which is external to the image pickup device in response to detection by the image pickup device of a connection, as required by claims 10 and 13. Further, the portions of Aizawa relied upon by the Examiner do not appear to overcome the deficiencies of Kayanuma with respect to the requirements of claims 10 and 13, as described above.

Accordingly, claims 10 and 13 are distinguishable over Kayanuma and Aizawa as applied by the Examiner.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that he/she telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which he might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Application No.: 10/587,117

Docket No.: SONYJP 3.3-519

Dated: February 16, 2010

Respectfully submitted,  
Electronic signature: /Davy E.  
Zoneraich/  
Davy E. Zoneraich  
Registration No.: 37,267  
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,  
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP  
600 South Avenue West  
Westfield, New Jersey 07090  
(908) 654-5000  
Attorney for Applicant

LD-4475  
1113977\_1.DOC